R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 562 UD 004 444

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, P.L. 89-10, TITLE I. EVALUATION REPORT, 1965-66.

VIRGINIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, RICHMOND

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.52 36P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ANNUAL REPORTS, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, ACTION PROGRAMS (COMMUNITY), *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, STUDENT NEEDS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, TABLES (DATA), ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SPECIAL SERVICES, ESEA TITLE 1, VIRGINIA

ONE SECTION OF THIS EVALUATION IS A DESCRIPTION OF TITLE I OPERATIONS AND SERVICES, METHODS OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, AND EVALUATION TECHNIQUES. THE MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS WERE IN (1) THE SUBMISSION OF INADEQUATELY PREPARED PROPOSALS BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, (2) MISCONCEPTIONS ON THEIR PART ABOUT THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF TITLE I, AND (3) LOCAL DIFFICULTIES IN COMPLETING REQUIRED EVALUATIONS. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205(A)(1) OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT CREATED PROBLEMS IN TERMS OF ITS MANDATORY FOCUS ON SERIOUSLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN TO THE EXCLUSION OF OTHERS. THIS SECTION ALSO DESCRIBES THE COORDINATION OF TITLE I ACTIVITIES WITH COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND WITH PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER OTHER TITLES OF THE ACT, AND DISCUSSES THE PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. A SECOND SECTION PRESENTS THE REQUISITE COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS DATA ON THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES, AND THE THIRD SECTION CONTAINS TABULAR DATA. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

04444

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23216

Elementary and Secondary Education Act
P. L. 89-10, Title I

Evaluation Report
1965-66

ED017562

PART I:

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES:

Meetings in each of the four P. L. 89-10, Title I regions of Virginia are held, when appropriate, under the direction of the Program Director. This year there will be two general meetings for each region. The assistant supervisors call meetings in their own regions at the request of the LEA or as they deem necessary. The Special Assistant to the Superintendent, and the Program Director accept many invitations to speak at meetings of the LEA's. In addition, a panel on Title I was set up at the Principals Meeting and the VEA meeting in Richmond. At the close of these meetings the Program Director is available for individual conferences.

The Assistant Supervisors and in some instances the Program Director make visits to all target schools. The Assistant Supervisors are available for conferences with project coordinators. Their services include suggestions to determine the needs of the children, suitable means of meeting these needs, serving as consultants for in-service training in some cases, selection and use of equipment, evaluation and bookkeeping methods.

Personnel in the state office are available for conferences with representatives of the LEA's who wish to come to Richmond. Also, many telephone calls are received from the LEA's and many letters are written.

PART I: (continued)

Necessary information is passed on to the LEA's by means of superintendents' memoranda.(Appendix 1). Forms for the convenience of the LEA's are printed and distributed by the state office. (Appendix 1)

In addition specialists employed by the State Department of Education offer their services as consultants to the LEA's in the various instructional and service areas. The state office encourages the LEA's to seek advice from these specialists for such areas as special education, art, music etc.

2. DISSEMINATION:

(a) The LEA's disseminated significant data on P. L. 89-10, Title I projects to assure that educational improvements were shared and pitfalls avoided, to stimulate cooperative effort and to gain public support for Title I activities and services.

(1) The following media were used by the LEA's to disseminate information to other LEA's.

Media Used	Number of Projects
Conferences (Local, District, State)	238
News Media (Newspaper, Magazine, Radio)	195
Lectures (Civic Groups, Cultural Groups, Educational Groups)	197
Publications (Brochures, Flashers, Flyers)	55
Observation of Programs (Visits, Movies, Slides)	80
Essay Type Evaluations	10

PART I: (continued)

(2) The following media were used by the LEA's to disseminate significant information to the SEA.

Media Used	Number of Projects
Conference (Local, District, State)	260
News Media (Newspaper)	74
Lectures (Educational Groups)	35
Publications (Brochures, Flyers)	53
Observation of Projects (Visits, Movies)	30

(b) The State Educational Agency will disseminate information on promising educational practices by:

(1) Summarizing effective educational practices developed and followed in an appropriate publication for distribution.

(2) Staff meetings at the State level.

(3) Regional conferences within the State.

3. EVALUATION:

(a) Specific guidelines for evaluating Title I projects were sent to each division superintendent. ("SUPTS. MEMO. NO. 4886" Appendix 2). The evaluation forms were designed to provide a standard format and to assure that information required was uniform.

(b) State personnel involved in providing evaluation assistance are as follows:

Alfred L. Wingo - Special Assistant to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. (10% of time)

Robert W. Sparks, Jr. - Program Director, Title I. (15% of time)

PART I: (continued)

W. Harrison McCann - Program Evaluator, Title I. (100% of time)

R. E. Bales - Assistant State Supervisor, Title I. (25% of time)

Alpha C. Smith and C. L. Conyers - Assistant State Supervisors, Title I. (15% of time)

B. Thornton Fletcher - Educational Grants Advisor, Title I. (15% of time)

(c) No special consultants were used to provide evaluation assistance to the State. However, assistance was obtained from other services of the State Department of Education.

(d) Number projects employing each of the following evaluation designs.

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
28	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
183	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
91	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
60	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
87	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
50	Other (specify) Anecdotal records, teacher and parent reactions, locally devised tests, health and attendance records and various combinations of the above.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS:

(a) Major problems encountered by the State of Virginia in administering the Title I program:

(1) Reviewing Proposals: Haziness of guidelines at certain points and misconceptions on the part of the LEA's as to the purpose of Title I caused our chief difficulties. Presently, proposals are reviewed by the assistant supervisors and generally arrive in the state office in acceptable condition. Beyond this they

PART I: (continued)

are reviewed by the program director, and the educational grants advisor. Most LEA's have had the experience of writing at least three projects and now understand the program quite well and do not find the preparation of a proposal the almost unsurmountable task they formerly thought they were facing. The early cut-off date for projects for 1965-66 fiscal year, May 2, left many of our LEA's without time to prepare a project at all. Others submitted projects which were not well thought out because of the race against the deadline.

(2) Operation and Service: Conflicts between federal guidelines and state laws have caused some problems. Funds under P. L. 89-10, Title I are provided to LEA's on a reimbursement basis only. Furthermore, the dual enrollment of private school students is not permissible. Public school teachers are not permitted to provide instruction in private schools.

LEA's complained in the beginning that there was no planning money available for project development, and had no funds to pay for the needed assistance. The shortage of personnel in the state office was an added factor also. LEA's in general refrained from accepting "ready-made projects" from salesmen. Also, the more able LEA personnel have always been willing to talk with neighboring LEA's and to permit them to see their projects in operation.

We frequently have to remind LEA's that the purpose of Title I is to saturate the target area in order to overcome the most outstanding problems. The target concept is difficult for some of them to accept.

(3) Evaluation: The evaluation instructions came to us so late that we were not able to give the LEA's comprehensive information until after many projects were completed. Although all LEA's had been informed that they should use pre and post-testing many ordered tests that were not delivered in time to be used

PART I: (continued)

or tests that had to be sent away for scoring and were not returned in time to be used in the evaluation. Evaluation placed a very heavy burden on most of the LEA's.

(b) Suggestions for revising P. L. 89-10, Title I: The more important revisions that we suggested earlier have been made. We still believe that the law should be amended so that all economically deprived and educationally disadvantaged children may be helped.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1):

(a) Projects were often written from the viewpoint of the over-all needs of the LEA with the objective "a fair share for everybody". Learning to assess the needs of the most seriously deprived children and to focus on them rather than on the total student body was a major problem. It was most painful for the representatives of the LEA to "discriminate" as they put it by having a program only in target schools and then, within the target school, by concentrating on the educationally disadvantaged.

Other projects which had to be revised were those that sought to provide in-service training without an instructional program or to purchase equipment without an organized instructional program.

In some instances projects were poorly written. Others were vague in that they gave an interesting general description of the region without spelling out the specific needs of the children.

(b) Common misconceptions of the LEA's about Title I: The notion that it provided general aid to education.

The notion that funds could be used to purchase equipment and materials without an organized and revised instructional program.

PART I: (continued)

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS:

a. Number of projects which served an area where there was an approved Community Action Program--166.

b. Total amount of Title I money approved for LEA where there was an approved Community Action Program--$8,816,504.42

c. Action taken at State level to insure coordination and cooperation between Title I applicants and Community Action Agencies at the local level are as follows:

(1) All applications for projects were checked to assure that statements by the Community Action Agency was included.

(2) Coordination is evidenced in the fact that one hundred and forty-six programs were reviewed by Community Action Agencies. Their recommendations, in many cases, were followed to improve the project.

(3) A statewide meeting was held at which both Title I and OEO staff members provided the leadership.

d. Refer to Par. C (2) above.

e. There were no major problem between Community Action Agencies and Local Education Agencies. However, in nineteen (19) cases minor problems existed in the employment of personnel.

f. Local Education Agencies and Community Action Agencies have worked generally in a cooperative manner with respect to the programs of each other. At all times emphasis has been placed on close coordination and this mutual confidence and support has tended to strengthen both programs. Comments in paragraphs above confirm this relationship.

PART I: (continued)

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF P. L. 89-10:

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) -- Not applicable

(g) We have no suggestions or recommendations to revise the legislation with regard to this matter. If, however, Title III projects, in certain instances, focus on the needs of the educationally disadvantaged, admirable opportunities for cooperation among all these Titles occur.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS:

Not applicable

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:

(a) As directed in Item 13D, p. 16 of the Instructions for Title I 1967 Application Forms, OE. 37003, we require that the LEA's contact private schools within the division and offer them any services for which they are eligible. We do not offer to send public school teachers to private schools. There is doubt as to the legality of this practice in the state of Virginia.

(b) There are no "cooperative" projects in this area. However, those divisions which have eligible private school children (mainly parochial) such services as loans of equipment, in-service training, special testing or guidance services have been well accepted. The responsibility for the program has been entirely with the LEA. During the summer there was a reasonable ratio of attendance of private school children in public school programs.

(c) There has been no particular difficulty with eligible private schools. Most secular private schools refuse to consider the services available under P. L. 89-10, Title I.

(d) None.

PART I: (continued)

(e) Number of non-public school children participating by type of arrangement:

Schedule	On Public School Grounds Only		On Non-Public School Grounds Only		On Both Public & Non-Public School Grounds		On Other Than Public or Non-Pub.Sch.Grounds	
	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children
Reg. School Day	4544		137		4681		65	
Before School Day	328				328			
After School	337				337			
Weekend								
Summer	156				156			
Reg. School Day & Before School								
Reg. School Day & After School	10		65		75			
Reg. School Day & Weekend								
Reg. School Day & Summer	79		72		151			
Before & After School	10				10			
After School & Weekend	10				10			
After Sch., Weekend & Summer	50				50			
After School & Summer	50				50			
Reg. School Day, Before School & After School	10				10			
Reg. School Day, Before Sch., After Sch., Weekend & Summer	225				225			
Other (Specify)			65		65			
TOTAL	5809		339		6148		65	

*This figure is not expected to be an unduplicated count of children.

PART I: (continued)

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS:

(a) HEW instructions and guidelines are adequate for the implementation of Title I programs. Supplementary guidelines are prepared when the need arises, (Appendix 1)

(b) Evaluation forms were prepared and the results were tabulated by the State Department of Education.

(c) See Table 7, Section III.

(d) Copies of the evaluations for the cities of Richmond and Norfolk are enclosed. Copies of the remaining 10% will follow.

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed*	Unduplicated Count of Children: Total Col.5, 6 & 7	Public	Non Public	Not Enrolled	Average cost per pupil Col.3 by Col.4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	5	4,335,174.33	25858	25323	159	376	167.65
B	9	2,225,292.04	10263	9841	212	210	216.82
C	5	405,654.58	2615	2471	5	139	155.12
D	41	5,427,146.76	26621	25746	38	837	203.86
E	58	8,438,312.65	51431	47954	0	3477	164.07
TOTAL	118	20,831,579.76	116788	111335	414	5039	178.37

*Disbursements and unliquidated obligations

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

The methods for establishing project areas are listed in rank order as used:

a. Local Survey

b. Records of free lunches and textbooks

c. Census

SMSA's	SURVEY	FREE BOOKS & LUNCHES	CENSUS	OTHER
A	13	4	12	13
B	17	22	23	11
C	10	2	1	1
D	87	53	39	32
E	150	103	88	50

3. NEEDS

The most pressing pupil needs are listed below in rank order by SMSA:

SMSA CLASSIFICATION

A.

1. Inadequate reading development
2. Inadequate provisions for educating handicapped
3. Poor health including nutritional deficiences
4. Deficient language skills
5. Cultural deprivation
6. Inadequate development in mathematics
7. Facilities deficiency

B.

1. Inadequate reading development
2. Poor health including nutritional deficiencies
3. Deficient language skills
4. Inadequate development in mathematics
5. Deficient physical fitness
6. Cultural deprivation
7. Inadequate provisions for educationally handicapped

C.

1. Inadequate reading development
2. Poor health including nutritional deficiencies
3. Deficient language skills
4. Cultural deprivation
5. Inadequate development in mathematics

D.

1. Inadequate reading development
2. Poor health including nutritional deficiencies
3. Deficient language skills
4. Cultural deprivation
5. Deficient physical fitness
6. Inadequate development in mathematics
7. Inadequate provisions for educating handicapped

E.

1. Inadequate reading development
2. Poor health including nutritional deficiencies
3. Deficient language skills
4. Cultural deprivation
5. Inadequate development in mathematics
6. Deficient physical fitness
7. Inadequate provisions for educating the handicapped
8. Inadequate facilities
9. Pre-school experience

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEM

Principal problems local officials encountered in implementing projects are indicated by rank within SMSA's.

Problem	SMSA				
	A	B	C	D	E
Lack of Personnel (Specialists)	1	1	1	1	1
Lack of Facilities	3	5	3	2	2
Slow Delivery of Materials	2	2	5	5	3
Lack of Planning Funds	5	6	6	3	4
Lack of Materials	4	4	4	6	5
Lack of Time	6	3	2	4	6

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES

The most prevalent types of Title I activities are indicated by rank within SMSA's.

Activities	SMSA				
	A	B	C	D	E
Reading, Language	1	1	1	1	1
Mathematics	2	3	4	3	3
Summer Program	4	6	2	8	6
Cultural Activities	3	4	5	4	2
In-Service Training	7	7	3	9	8
Education for Handicapped	9	9	6	5	9
Physical Education	5	2	8	6	5
Teacher Aide	8	5	9	7	7
Pre-School Program	6	8	7	2	4

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

The number of innovative and/or exemplary projects or activities that include new approaches are indicated by SMSA.

Activity	SMSA				
	A	B	C	D	E
Summer Program		1	1	2	4
In-Service Training		3			
Pre-School Programs				2	3
Teacher Aide	1	1			1
Reading Program		5	1	6	9
Music Program				1	1
Experience Trips				1	
Vocational Program					1

Specific state project numbers and complete description of many of these innovations are available at the State Department of Education.

7. METHODS LEA USED IN INCREASING, DEVELOPING, AND MAKING MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF TITLE I STAFF

	SMSA					TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	LEA's
1. In-Service Training	2	4	0	10	30	46
2. Provision of Supervision	0	1	1	7	5	14
3. Provision of Teacher Aides	2	2	0	8	13	25
4. Curricula Materials Center	0	1	1	1	1	4
5. Team Teaching	0	2	0	1	0	3

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Most prevalently used evaluation instruments.

(a) Kindergarten - Pre-Kindergarten	SMSA					TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	LEA's
Metropolitan Readiness	1	1	0	6	12	20
Peabody Vocabulary and Picture	0	0	0	1	0	1
Gates Primary Readiness	0	0	0	0	1	1
Teacher Observation	2	1	1	2	7	13

(b) Grades 1-3	SMSA					TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	LEA's
California Tests	1	0	0	5	11	17
Metropolitan Reading	0	1	1	4	8	14
SRA	1	0	0	0	6	7
Stanford Achievement W&4	0	1	1	2	3	7
Kuhlemann-Finch Scales, A&B	0	0	1	3	2	6
Gates Basic Reading Forms I&II	0	0	0	2	4	6
Scott Foresman Tests	1	0	0	0	1	2
Arithmetic Wide Range Achievement	0	0	0	0	1	1
Teacher Observation	2	3	0	3	12	20

(c) Grades 4-6	SMSA					TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	LEA's
California Tests	1	1	0	5	10	17
SRA	1	0	1	5	10	17
Metropolitan Reading	0	1	0	4	4	9
Stanford Achievement W&4	0	1	0	3	4	8
Gates Basic Reading	0	0	1	1	4	6
Kuhlemann-Finch Scales A&B	0	0	0	2	0	2
Sheldon Reading	0	0	0	0	1	1
Arithmetic Wide Range Achievement	0	0	0	0	1	1
Teacher Observation	2	3	0	3	14	22

(d) Grades 7-9	SMSA					TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	LEA's
Iowa Reading	1	0	2	2	10	15
California Tests	0	0	1	5	8	14
SRA	0	0	1	2	8	11
Metropolitan Reading	0	1	0	3	4	8
Stanford Achievement W&4	1	1	0	1	5	8
Gates Basic Reading I&II	0	0	0	3	3	6
Kuhlemann-Finch Scales A&B	0	0	0	2	0	2
Gates Reading Survey I&II	0	0	0	3	3	1
Teacher Observation	2	3	0	3	8	16

(e) Grades 10-12	SMSA					TOTAL LEA's
	A	B	C	D	E	
California Tests	0	0	0	2	5	7
Metropolitan Reading	1	1	0	1	2	5
SRA	0	0	0	0	4	4
Gates Reading Survey	0	1	0	1	2	4
Scat & Step	0	0	1	1	2	4
Iowa Reading	0	1	0	0	1	2
Stanford Achievement	0	0	0	0	2	2
Botel Reading Inventory	0	0	0	1	0	1
Teacher Observation	1	2	0	4	5	12

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

(a) Five most effective activities showing frequency within SMSA by grade groups.

Pre K.-3

SMSA	Language and Communication Skills	Cultural Enrichment	Physical Education	Nutrition	Purposeful Play Activities
A	0	0	1	1	0
B	3	4	1	2	2
C	1	1	0	1	0
D	5	14	4	4	4
E	20	22	12	10	7
TOTAL	29	41	18	18	13

Grades 4-6

SMSA	Remedial Reading	Cultural Enrichment	Physical Education and Health (Including Nutrition)	Reduction of Class Size by Teacher Aides	Mathematics
A	1	1	1	2	0
B	3	2	1	1	0
C	0	0	0	0	0
D	15	13	6	2	2
E	29	28	11	5	4
TOTAL	48	44	18	10	6

Grades 7-12

SMSA	Remedial Reading	Cultural Enrichment	Physical Education and Health (Including Nutrition)	Reduction of Class Size by Teacher Aides	Mathematics
A	1	2	0	1	1
B	2	3	0	0	0
C	0	0	0	0	0
D	13	10	5	4	2
E	27	23	13	4	6
TOTAL	43	38	18	9	9

(b) Weaknesses of Critical Procedural Aspects for Projects listed Including Frequency of Occurrence in SMSA's Reported by LEA's

SMSA	Late Arrival of Equipment and Supplies	Inability to Find Trained Teachers for Special Subjects & to Secure Services of Psychoanalyst, Dentists & Doctors	Inadequate Parental Support	Lack of Transport-ation for Field Trips	Inadequate Facilities Lack of Space	Short Dura-tion of Project
A	2	2	0	0	0	1
B	2	1	0	1	1	2
C	0	0	1	0	0	0
D	15	12	2	2	1	0
E	16	19	2	0	2	1
TOTAL	35	34	5	3	4	4

It should be noted that this is a sample. In reading all the evaluations, it was found that at least 10 LEA's stated that in the early period of 1965-66 they did not get sufficient guidance from the State.

Strengths of Critical Procedural Aspects with Frequency of Occurrence in SMSA's as Reported by LEA's

SMSA	Increased Motivation of Students	New Teaching Equipment in Sufficient Quantity	Increase in Cult-ural and Aspira-tional Level of Children	Improve-ment in Academic Skills	Improve-ment in Health of Students	Good Co-operation Between Faculty and Admin-istration	Improve. in Facil. such as Provi. of Mobile Units
A	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
B	2	3	1	1	2	1	0
C	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	9	5	5	3	3	2
E	22	12	14	13	12	3	4
TOTAL	35	25	20	19	18	7	6

It is felt that the major contribution in strengthening the program was made by the individuals at the LEA level, who worked enthusiastically often on their own time, in developing the program, supervising its operation, and evaluating the results.

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

The impact of P. L. 89-10, Title I, on education in Virginia is significant and substantial.

Nearly all of our LEA's mentioned the positive change in the aspirational level and self image of the educationally disadvantaged child. Individual attention, smaller classes, a wealth of modern equipment, teachers who are specialists in their field, in-service training for teachers, cultural enrichment, attention to health problems, proper nutrition and adequate space are mentioned as factors in the change.

The results of remedial summer work has surprised the educators themselves. Some feel that a continuation of summer programs will raise the educationally deprived child to a level with his peers and eliminate one of the greatest problems in our schools. This statement with reference to their summer program is fairly representative of all. "The idea that this type of parent could not be reached and would not be cooperative was refuted. The average daily attendance was as high or higher than the regular school year. The attendance of the parents at the individual school "Open House" was outstanding."

Title I is seen by the LEA as a tool for combatting the drop-out problem by means of early remediation, attendance and counseling service and an offering of realistic vocational and industrial courses which will hold the child's interest through to graduation and provide him with skills to find a job after high school.

Attitudes of parents, children, educators and communities have begun to change. Children who are helped to be successful come to enjoy school and are a pleasure to teach. Parents are pleased to see that their children can learn and have shown their appreciation through letters and visits to the schools.

The employment of teacher aides has contributed greatly, in many instances to the success of P. L. 89-10, Title I, projects. The use of para-professionals provides the opportunity for teachers to establish a previously unattainable rapport with the educationally disadvantaged child.

Cultural experiences and field trips increased the self confidence of the disadvantaged student who previously misunderstood many issues and ideas in the world around him. This is a quotation from one of the reports: "In a rural area, such as Louisa County, children have little opportunity for enrichment experiences in the areas of music, art and drama. The enrichment program conducted this summer was an outstanding success. Interest was stimulated to the extent that many students involved will continue cultural activity during the regular school session and investigate wider horizons on their own."

The Prince William County report stated---"Professional health services enabled schools to complete the most accurate health and physical check ever conducted. Results of this survey led to a more informed group of parents and resulted in much needed medical and dental corrections, some of which were done with Title I funds."

PART III - TABULAR DATA

TABLE I

Selected sample of representative projects in skill development subjects and attitudinal and behavioral development, indicating the number of projects which employed each of the specified types of standardized tests and other measures.

NO. PROJECTS IN THE SAMPLE - 320										
	PROJECTS IN SKILL DEVELOPMENT SUBJECTS					PROJECTS IN ATTITUDINAL & BEHAVIORAL DEVELOPMENT				
MEASURES		Pre-K/ Kindgn	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K/ Kindgn	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
1. Standard-ized Tests & Inventories		63	243	268	292	98	35	31	35	38	8
a. Achievement		12	145	176	174	62	1	6	6	7	3
b. Intelligence		20	48	45	53	16	16	3	3	5	1
c. Aptitude		10	13	11	22	5	1	1	1	1	-
d. Interest		2	9	11	17	4	--	2	3	4	1
e. Attitude		2	9	10	12	5	12	18	20	18	2
f. Other (specify)		17	19	15	14	6	5	1	2	3	1
2. Other Tests		15	111	117	120	51	11	17	22	23	10
a. Locally-Devised		7	14	11	14	8	6	7	9	8	3
b. Teacher-Made		7	88	97	100	43	5	10	13	15	7
c. Other (specify)		1	9	9	6	--	-	--	--	--	-
3. Other Measures		100	350	398	400	172	93	229	259	249	112
a. Teacher Ratings		40	133	148	152	57	31	78	87	83	35
b. Anecdotal Records		35	115	125	121	46	36	74	81	75	26
c. Observer Reports		23	88	100	104	50	23	61	70	71	34
d. Other (specify)		2	14	25	23	19	3	16	21	20	17

TABLE II

Summary of major types of projects that showed progress in achieving their objective. Each project and objective coded according to OE 37003 dated June 17, 1966. Approximately 85% of projects included.

(116) READING PROGRAMS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 12 Improve classroom performance in Reading				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 32 Change attitude toward school and education		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substantial	Some	Little or No	Substantial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	21	7	2	6	2	-
Grades 1-3	38	57	8	10	16	3
Grades 4-6	36	67	11	19	17	5
Grades 7-9	36	58	9	9	20	6
Grades 10-12	19	20	4	6	10	3
TOTALS	150	209	34	50	65	17

(123) PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 52 Improve physical health of children				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 43 Reduce rate of disciplinary problems		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substantial	Some	Little or No	Substantial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	5	3	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	8	7	-	3	1	-
Grades 4-6	10	6	1	2	1	-
Grades 7-9	7	5	1	1	1	1
Grades 10-12	2	3	2	1	1	1
TOTALS	32	24	4	7	4	2

(122) MUSIC

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 13 Improve classroom performance				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 23 Improve non-verbal functioning		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	2	4	1	-	-	-
Grades 4-6	3	4	2	1	-	-
Grades 7-9	2	5	1	-	1	-
Grades 10-12	1	2	1	-	-	-
TOTALS	8	15	5	1	1	-

(113) CULTURAL ENRICHMENT

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 32 Change attitude toward school and education				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 33 To change their occupational and educational aspirational levels		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	2	1	-	-	-	1
Grades 1-3	4	2	1	3	1	1
Grades 4-6	6	2	1	4	3	1
Grades 7-9	3	5	1	3	4	1
Grades 10-12	1	3	2	-	4	1
TOTALS	16	13	5	10	12	5

(111) ART PROGRAMS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 23 To improve children's non-verbal functioning					SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 33 To raise occupational and educational aspirational levels.			
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED				PROGRESS ACHIEVED			
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No		Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-		-	-	-	
Grades 1-3	-	1	-		-	1	-	
Grades 4-6	-	1	-		-	1	-	
Grades 7-9	-	1	-		-	1	-	
Grades 10-12	-	-	-		-	-	-	
TOTALS	-	3	-		-	3	-	

(220) ATTENDANCE PROGRAMS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 44 To improve children's average daily attendance					SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 53 Improve emotional and social stability			
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED				PROGRESS ACHIEVED			
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No		Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-		-	-	-	
Grades 1-3	-	1	-		1	-	-	
Grades 4-6	1	1	-		1	-	-	
Grades 7-9	1	1	-		1	-	-	
Grades 10-12	-	-	-		-	-	-	
TOTALS	2	3	-		3	-	-	

(114) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 22 To improve verbal functioning				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 34 Increase expectation of success in school		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	3	3	-	1	4	-
Grades 4-6	1	3	-	1	4	-
Grades 7-9	2	4	-	1	4	-
Grades 10-12	2	2	-	1	2	-
TOTALS	8	12	-	4	14	-

(211) FOOD-BREAKFAST

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 51 Improve physical health of children				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 32 Change attitude toward school and education		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	2	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 4-6	2	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 7-9	2	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 10-12	1	-	-	1	-	-
TOTALS	7	-	-	7	-	-

(127) GENERAL-ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 13 Improve classroom performance				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 34 Increase expectation of success in school		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	1	-	-	1	-	-
Grades 1-3	1	-	-	1	-	-
Grades 4-6	1	-	-	1	-	-
Grades 7-9	1	-	-	1	-	-
Grades 10-12	1	-	-	1	-	-
TOTALS	5	-	-	5	-	-

(221) GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 31 Improve self-image				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 13 Improve classroom performance		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Grades 4-6	1	1	1	1	1	1
Grades 7-9	2	1	1	2	3	1
Grades 10-12	2	1	1	3	2	1
TOTALS	6	4	4	7	7	4

(216) HEALTH PROGRAMS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 51 Improve physical health				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 52 Improve nutritional health of children		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	1	-	-	3	-
Grades 1-3	1	4	-	3	5	-
Grades 4-6	1	4	-	3	6	-
Grades 7-9	1	3	-	3	6	-
Grades 10-12	-	1	-	-	3	-
TOTALS	3	13	-	9	23	-

(120) KINDERGARTEN

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 34 Increase expectation of success in school				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 53 Improve emotional and social stability		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	13	4	-	5	4	-
Grades 1-3	-	1	-	-	1	-
Grades 4-6	-	1	-	-	1	-
Grades 7-9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 10-12	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	13	6	-	5	6	-

(222) LIBRARY SERVICES

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 12 Improve classroom performance beyond expectation				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 33 Raise occupational and educational aspirations		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grades 1-3	-	1	-	-	1	-
Grades 4-6	1	1	-	1	1	-
Grades 7-9	1	1	-	1	1	-
Grades 10-12	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	2	3	-	2	3	-

(121) MATHEMATICS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 34 Increase expectation of success in school				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 13 Improve classroom performance		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	1	1	-	1	1	-
Grades 1-3	1	3	-	3	4	-
Grades 4-6	2	2	-	3	4	-
Grades 7-9	2	2	-	5	7	-
Grades 10-12	-	-	-	1	2	-
TOTALS	6	8	-	13	18	-

(126) SOCIAL STUDIES

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 53 Improve emotional and social stability					SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 34 Increase expectation of success in school		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED				PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No		Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	2	-	-		-	-	-
Grades 1-3	2	-	-		-	-	-
Grades 4-6	2	1	-		-	-	-
Grades 7-9	2	1	-		-	1	-
Grades 10-12	2	1	-		1	-	-
TOTALS	8	3	-		1	1	-

(129) SPECIAL EDUC. FOR HANDICAPPED

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 31 Improve self-image					SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 32 Change attitude toward school and education		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED				PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substan-tial	Some	Little or No		Substan-tial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	-	-	-		-	-	-
Grades 1-3	4	1	-		2	4	-
Grades 4-6	4	1	-		2	4	1
Grades 7-9	3	-	-		2	4	-
Grades 10-12	1	-	-		-	1	-
TOTALS	12	2	-		6	13	1

(224) TUTORING - AFTER SCHOOL

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: 32 Change attitude toward school and education				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE: 13 Improve classroom skills and performance		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substantial	Some	Little or No	Substantial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	3	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 1-3	3	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 4-6	3	-	-	2	-	-
Grades 7-9	-	1	-	-	1	-
Grades 10-12	-	1	-	-	1	-
TOTALS	9	2	-	6	2	-

OTHER - MISCELLANEOUS

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:				SECONDARY OBJECTIVE:		
	PROGRESS ACHIEVED			PROGRESS ACHIEVED		
SCHOOL LEVEL	Substantial	Some	Little or No	Substantial	Some	Little or No
Pre-Kdgn/ Kindergarten	6	1	-	3	2	-
Grades 1-3	8	7	-	7	7	2
Grades 4-6	7	7	-	6	6	2
Grades 7-9	7	5	1	6	6	4
Grades 10-12	5	1	1	5	5	4
TOTALS	32	21	2	27	26	12

TABLE III

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

	1963 - 1964				1964 - 1965			1965 - 1966			
	TITLE I Schools		% ALL Schools		TITLE I Schools		ALL SCHOOLS	TITLE I SCHOOLS		Approx. 70% St. Totals	
GRADE	ADA	ADM	% ATT	ADM	ADA	ADM	% ADM	% ATT	ADM	% ATT	ADM
12th								93.02		94.80	
11th								92.22		93.49	
10th	NOT AVAILABLE		94		NOT AVAILABLE		94	92.37		93.55	
9th								92.41		93.71	
8th								92.34		94.30	
7th								92.75		94.81	
6th								93.52		95.10	
5th			94				94	93.88		94.53	
4th								92.95		94.97	
3rd								92.80		94.72	
2nd								92,62		83.75	
1st								91.68		81.87	
Kindgn Pre-k/								89.88		91.52	

NOTE: See next page for detailed break-out

TITLE I EVALUATION - PART 3 - TABLE 3 (continued)

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE, AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP, & PERCENT OF ATTENDANCE FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS AND NON-TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS, SCHOOL SESSION 1965-1966

STATE

	TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS			NON-TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS		
GRADE	ADA	ADM	% ATTEND	ADA	ADM	% ATTEND
KG	3,082.59	3,429.59	89.88	1,782.10	1,947.27	91.52
G1	26,652.99	29,071.80	91.68	25,665.97	31,349.29	81.87
G2	25,539.12	27,574.72	92.62	24,718.64	29,515.11	83.75
G3	24,448.95	26,346.76	92.80	23,209.71	24,503.58	94.72
G4	24,423.81	26,275.40	92.95	24,841.29	26,155.70	94.97
G5	23,365.57	24,888.13	93.88	23,639.92	25,008.78	94.53
G6	21,865.84	23,379.80	93.52	23,763.01	24,986.92	95.10
G7	23,088.35	24,894.21	92.75	20,190.95	21,295.31	94.81
G8	18,275.22	19,790.42	92.34	17,651.47	18,718.84	94.30
G9	15,283.86	16,539.86	92.41	16,186.17	17,272.34	93.71
G10	13,498.33	14,613.21	92.37	12,749.10	13,628.61	93.55
G11	11,806.16	12,802.80	92.22	11,408.97	12,203.27	93.49
G12	11,254.63	12,099.21	93.02	10,916.35	11,514.58	94.80
TOT	242,585.42	261,705.91	92.69	236,723.65	258,099.60	91.72

TABLE V

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

	1963-1964		1964-1965		1965-1966	
GRADES	TITLE I Schools	NON-TITLE I Schools	TITLE I Schools	NON-TITLE I Schools	TITLE I Schools	NON-TITLE I Schools
12						
11	Breakout by grades not available at this time					
10						
9						
8						
7						
Lower Grade Levels						
No. of Schools	166	133	185	163	268	231
Total No. of Studdents	86,720	54,446	94,175	66,089	134,166	100,372
No. of Dropouts	2,035	889	2,511	1,439	3,816	2,075

NOTE: Figures used in this table represent approximately 85% of projects involved.

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

	1963-1964		1964-1965		1965-1966	
	TITLE I Schools	1/	TITLE I Schools	1/	TITLE I Schools	1/
TOTAL NO. OF GRADUATES	13,436		16,685		17,115	
NO. OF SCHOOLS	144		152		173	
MEAN SIZE OF GRADUATING CLASS	93.31		109.77		98.93	
NO. OF SCHOOLS HAVING 0-10% CONTINUING GRADUATES	39		39		46	
11-20%	14		10		12	
21-30%	22		27		34	
31-40%	38		28		31	
41-50%	16		20		26	
51-60%	5		14		7	
61-99%	10		14		17	

NOT AVAILABLE

A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, a Vocational, Commercial, or Technical Institute, or a Nursing School.

TABLE VII

(RESULTS FOR MOST WIDELY USED TESTS FOR ARITHMETIC)

(TITLE I BENEFICIARIES (OR SCHOOLS)

GRADE	Month & Year Tested	TEST NAME	FORM	N SCHOOLS	N STUDENTS	RAW SCORE X	RAW SCORE S.D.	Number of Students or Schools 25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile

Refer to Question 8, Part II
Information beyond this reference
is not presently available

PART III: (continued)

(A) The five most commonly funded P. L. 89-10, Title I projects in Virginia by project objectives were:

1. Improvement of classroom performance in reading
2. Positive change in attitude toward school and education
3. Increased expectation of success in school
4. Increased expectation of success in mathematics
5. Improvement of physical health

(B) The most common approaches used to reach these objectives were:

A-1. Improvement of classroom performance in reading was accomplished by:

1. Employment of reading specialists
2. Provision for in-service training for teachers
3. Provision for consultants
4. Reduction of class size
5. Use of teacher aides
6. Specialized equipment and books
7. Guidance--counseling
8. Attendance services

A-2. Positive change in attitude toward school and education was brought about by:

1. Providing cultural enrichment through the addition of creative arts to the instructional program.
2. Encouraging active participation on the part of the children through learning to use musical instruments, singing, presentation of plays, etc.

3. Educational field trips
4. Health services
5. Food services

A-3. Increased expectation of success in school was accomplished by:

1. Operating kindergarten programs
2. Improving manual and physical skills
3. Provision for health, nutrition and medical services

A-4. Increased expectation of success in mathematics was approached by:

1. Use of diagnostic tests
2. Employment of specialists as teachers
3. Relief of teachers from clerical work through use of aides
4. Individualized tutoring
5. In-service training for teachers
6. Purchase of adequate supporting modern equipment and instructional supplies
7. Provision of extra work space where necessary
8. Making the subject interesting
9. Use of stimulating teaching materials

A-5. Improvement of the physical health of the children was approached through:

1. Employment of physical education teachers and aides
2. Adequate medical and dental examinations
3. Immunization and treatment
4. Food services
5. Installation of playground equipment
6. Providing adequate clothing